1893-94
(L. R.)

File No. 116 of 93
Serial No. 1-22

Sub - Appeal of Ragupathaiah Regarding the Share in the Inam lands of Dodakere Anekal Taluk

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

File. No. 2[illegible] of 73

1893-94

192

(L. R.)

File No 116 of 93

Serial Nos. 1-22

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. 1-22

Major ~~Part~~ B for November 1900

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Raghupatinaik, regarding the share in the Inam lands of Oodakere, Anekal taluk.

98

Countermarked Narayana Rao

Rd

Indexed

34B

WD 2233 — — 20,000 — 1-6-20

57) against this order an appeal was preferred by
Ragupathia to this office on 5. 10. 93 stating
that while his claim had already been established
as was evident from the decisions noted in
the margin above and from the fact that
in accordance with the decree the said
land together with the cost of litigation
were made over to him, it was unjust
to refer him to the Civil Courts again
on the plea that the former suit was
only for mirasi and that seeing ~~&~~
~~that~~ the Inam lands attached to the
Shanbhogue of Vdenur Golahalli

vide L. R. 25873 for previous notes
(paras 1 to 57)

2

Nosemurgolanalli (referred to in the decision) were restored without any special establishment of huck, the lower authorities erred in thinking that special establishment of huck was necessary for Amanidoddakere Inam lands, which were also included in the decision referred to and praying that orders might be issued for the restoration of the Inam lands to him.

(58) This petn was forwarded× to the Dy Commr for submission of the proceedings together with a report on the facts of the case and on the points urged in the petn

(59) On 2-12-'93 Raghupathiah submitted a petn to this office requesting that the Dy Commr might be ordered to have the produce of his Shanbhogue Inam lands kept in deposit pending the disposal of his appeal to this office. This was also — forwarded× to the Dy Commr:

(60) In letter× No 1389 d/ 23rd May '94 the Dy Commr stated as follows:—

"The Amildar rejected the petr's application and directed him to obtain possession of the "Muras" by a regular suit if he liked to do so. Against this order the petr appealed to the Divisional officer and to me. But I declined to interfere, as the Shanbhogue Inams having been enfranchised are subject to

suit

× vide Pet/757 d/ 15-11-93
S. No 5 File 3.

vide Abstract of B/R No 1479
S. No 7 File 3.

× vide S.M. Pet/888 d/ 9-12-93
S. No 8 File 3.

× Not in the records - This is taken from the office Note d/ 2-10-'96.

suit in the Civil Court. I now find that the Shanbhogue Inams in Anekal Taluk have not been enfranchised yet and therefore my above order is not right. If the records are returned to me I shall dispose of the matter on its merits."

(1) The records were returned× as desired for a revision of the Dy Commr's Proceedings stating that Shanbhogue Service Inams have not been enfranchised in this Province anywhere. × vide No $\frac{5336}{\text{P.F. 39-94}}$ d. 19-9-94 S. No 14 File B.

(2) This docket was forwarded× to the 2nd Gl Asstt Commr: for report on the following points:— × vide Memo No 3153 d. 1-3-95 S. No 26 Dt. File.

(1) How is the petr entitled to a share in the Shanbhogue emoluments.
(2) What are the Shanbhogue Inams?
(3) By whom are they enjoyed and to what extent and on what right.
(4) What are the lands in dispute.
(5) What is the dispute and between whom.
(6) How do the records bear out the several contentions.
(7) What does the decree show. Is it in force.

(3) On 16.5.95 the 2nd Gl Asstt Commr: called× for a similar report from the Amildar, who on 20.6.95 submitted the following report× in reply to the several points noted:— × vide order No 685 S. No 26 Dt. File. × vide Rept No 931 S. No 26 Dt. File.

(1) As the petr Raghunathiah was a Hissedar to the Shanbhogue of Anantapur? in 1870 a decree was granted entitling him to half hisse of the Inam lands. He says that accordingly the produce of the lands must be ordered to be given to him by those who are in possession of the same. It is understood that

he was enjoying the produce accordingly.

(2) The service Inam is wet land S. No 4 under Annaikere.

(3) These lands measuring $\overset{A}{2}$ - $\overset{G}{35}$ and assessed at Rs 17 are in the enjoyment of Venkatadayya, Shanbhogue Gumastha.

(4) Wet land S. No 4.

(5) The dispute is for half share of the Inam lands on the plea that petr is half sharer of the Shanbhogue also and is between the former Registrar Subbarayappa and Raghupathiah.

(6) In accordance with Divisional order No 129 d/ 20-7-93 to the effect that the petn was rejected as the petr Raghupathiah had to establish his Shanbhogue right prior to his claiming the lands and that an Endt to that effect should be given to petr, an Endt was given to petr. As desired by the Registerdar Subbarayappa his adopted son Ramachendrayappa has been registered as Hakkudar and Venkatadayya appointed Gumastha.

(7) The decree is not forthcoming in the records.

X vide Serial No. 8 & 21 File B.
X vide O.M. Pet/P.39-94 d/ 1-4-95 S. No 23 File 3.

(8) Raghupathiah submitted two X reminder petns regarding the Inam lands. The latter of these was forwarded to the Dy Commr: with reference to this office No 5336/P.F. 39-94 d/ 19-9-94 with a request that the Dy Commr's decision on the merits may be communicated to petr.

The following Endt x was also granted to petr:—

x vide Endt No 3124 dt 1-4-'95 S. No 22 File B.

As ordered on your appeal petn the Dy Commr: in submitting the records stated that he was under a false impression that Shanbhogue Inam lands had been enfranchised and that if the records were returned he would dispose of the matter on its merits: Accordingly the records were sent to the Dy Commr: on 24.9.94 for issuing a fresh order, and he is requested to communicate his decision to you.

x vide Pet / 39-94 on the above.

A copy of this was forwarded x for information to the Dy Commr: D. who forwarded x it to the 2nd Gl Asst Commr:

x vide No R 32 dt 4-5-'96 S. No 37 Dt. File.

(5) On 11.11.'96 Raghupathiah submitted a petn stating that the disposal of his case which was referred to the Gl Asst Commr for enquiry had been delayed as the records that were sent to the District were not forthcoming and praying that early orders may be issued to the District to search for the missing records. This petn together with petn No 971 dt 5.10.93 & its enclosures was forwarded x for early attention to the Dy Commr: who forwarded x the same to the Gl Asst Commr:

x vide Abstract of Petn No [illegible] S. No 25 File B.

x vide O.M. Pet / F 39-94 dt 25-11-'95 S. No 28 File B.

x vide Endt No 273 dt 3-12-96 S. No 40 Dt. File.

(6) On 23.12.96 Raghupathiah deposed before the Genl Asst Commr: to the effect:—

x vide S. No 15 Dt. File.

(1) that it was evident from the marginally noted x papers that he was Hakdar and Shareholder to the Shanbhogee

x (1) Decree in O.S. No 7 of 1869-70 on the file of the European Asst Court.
(2) Decree No 17 of 1871 of Nandidroog Dn
(3) Copy of order granted to respondent by the Chief Commr: in 1871.

Shaubhoga of Anekal Doddallore;
that half the lands which were
made over to him in accordance
with the said decrees passed out of
his possession when he was deprived
of his Shanbhogue; that no order
was issued to him by Govt: direction
that the said lands which were
in his possession should be
relinquished; that as he was deprived
of the Shanbhoga so he was deprived
of the lands also in Sepr 1877;
that since then he has been
submitting petitions regarding
his appointment; that if he is
restored to office he is confident
of getting back the whole of the lands;
(2) that he has not got the share
-bharike Inam lands Accounts
with him; that the required inform
-ation should be obtained from
the Taluk; that what was stated
in the Amildar's report might

be true;
(3) that he did not know whether
it was the Shanbhogue Ganiyotha.
dinkandayya or some one else
that was in the enjoyment of the
lands; that he did not also know
whether the whole or a part of the
lands were being enjoyed;
(4) that the dispute was regarding
the Inam lands;
(5) that orders should be issued
restoring his Shanbhoga to him;
⑥ that he was deprived of office on
insufficient grounds; that even if
the Shanbhogee were not restored to
him, half the Inam lands of the
Shanbhoga should be restored to him;

that

hat half the said lands were
eing enjoyed by the members of
is family since the time of
his father and ~~that~~ the produce
f those years should be given
o him.

(67) On 21. 10. 87 Raghupathiah
ubmitted a petn to Govt praying × vide Rpt No. 373 S. No 30 File B.
~~hat~~ his case may be disposed of
y Govt and ~~that~~ pending the disposal
f the appeal the produce of the
lands might be ordered to be
ept in reserve.

This petn was also
orwarded × to the Dy Commr. × vide O.M. $\frac{\text{Pet}}{\text{F.37-94}}$ S. No 31 File B

(68) On 7. 1. 87 Raghupathiah
ubmitted × a petn stating that Subbaraya × vide Rpt No × 3757 S. No 33 File A.
had committed very grave offences × vide Sep... [illegible]
nd did not deserve reinstatement file [illegible]
nd that both Subbaraya and his
lder brother Ramayya had no
hildren; and prayed that
he Shanbhogue of Vosamanahalli,
idihoskote and Amanikerehalli
ight be registered in his name
nd ~~that~~ if this could not be
one, the same might be registered
n the name of his son Ramamurthi.

This petn was returned × for submission × vide Endt No 359 d 1-6-87 S. No 25 of Old File.
hrough the Dy Commr:

(69) On 8. 11. 87 Raghupathiah
ubmitted a petn × to the Dewan × vide Rpt No 2373 S. No 41 File A.
ppealing against the Dy Commr's
ndts No 167 d 19-4-87 and 197 d
1-10-87 (N.B. Both these are not
orthcoming in the records) and
raying ~~that~~ on a perusal of
order No 2004 d 25-6-74 he may
be restored to the Shanbhogue of
the

8.

the three villages in question or that the same might be registered in his son Ramamurthi's name. Thereupon he was referred to previous decisions.)

x vide Petn No 3000 S. No 15 File B. + Destroyed

(70) On 10.5.95 Raghupattiah submitted a petn to this office stating that in obedience to this office Endt No 3159 d/ 1.6.87 he submitted a petn to the Dy Commr on 16.3.93 regarding his dismissal from the Shanbhogee of Siddavanahalli and Amanidoddakere; that he was in reply granted Endt No 28 d/ 14-4-93 directing him to submit his petn to the Sub-Dn officer; that he accordingly submitted a petn to that officer on 27-4-93 and that it was still pending disposal and praying that orders might be issued for expediting the disposal of the same.

x vide S. Nos 18 + 19 File B. Destroyed

Reminder petns were submitted on 11-11-95 and 4.3.96 respectively.

x vide Endt No 1063 attached to S. No 42 of Dt. File.

(71) On 21.11.'97 the Dy Commr granted an Endt to Raghupattiah stating that it was understood from the records that he was dismissed from office 20 years back for having committed theft; that therefore nothing could be done at present after the lapse of so long a time and that if his dismissal was wrong he ought to have appealed against that order then and there.

(72) On 30-11-'97 Raghupattiah appealed

9

appealed against this order to Govt submitting a genealogical tree and stating

× vide Pet. No 1390 S. No 42 Dt. File. and S. No 32 File B.

× appended

(1) ~~that~~ the Shanbhogue of the villages of Sidihalkote, Amanidoddakere and Hosamangalahalli was for a long time held hereditarily by the members of his family;

(2) ~~that~~ he was the Hakdar to the Shanbhogue of Hosamangalahalli and half hissedar in the Shanbhogue of Amanidoddakere and Sidihalkote, the duties of which were being discharged by his cousin Subbaraya and was also getting half hissa from Ramayya, brother of Subbaraya, who was doing the duties of Hosamangalahalli Shanbhogue;

(3) ~~that~~ Subbaraya was dismissed with Hak in 1871 for a series of faults; ~~that~~ on appeal the order of dismissal was confirmed;

× vide order of 17-12-73 passed on Pet. No 2151 attached to S. No 42 Dt. File.

(4) ~~that~~ his elder brother Ramayya was also dismissed from service in 1873;

(5) ~~that~~ on an appeal preferred by him to the Deputy Commr. his Hak was recognized and he was accordingly ordered to do the duties of the Shanbhogue of all the villages.

(6) ~~that~~ one Ramathirayya meanwhile set up his claim for the same but resigned ~~explained~~ it in his favour by means of a Rajinama and a petn. to the Dt. of 22-8-76;

(7) ~~that~~ he was dismissed from service on a false charge and through the

10

the misrepresentations and misdoings of his Cousin Subbamma with the cooperation of the then Amildar;

(8) that his appeal against the order of dismissal was still pending before the Chf Asst Commr;

(9) that the Dy Commr's order No 206 of 22-6-91 passed on Nanjamma's appeal was just but was only partly given effect to by the registry of only Nosenur-gollahalli in the name of Ramamurthi;

(10) that there was ample evidence establishing his right to the two other villages (such as decrees &ca already referred);

(11) that the Dewan's Proceedings never meant ~~that~~ the Hak should go to a boy adopted by Subbamma subsequent to the passing of the Proceedings;

This is found [illegible] [illegible]

and praying that the Dy Commr's order No 206 of 22-6-91 might be confirmed and ~~that~~ the Shanbhoge of Sidihoshalli and Potikere might be registered in his son Ramamurthi's name.

(73) This petn was forwarded to the Dy Commr: calling for a report with records of the case.

x vide O.M. Pet/739-94 of 22-12-97 S. No 33 File B.

In reply the Dy Commr: submitted a report stating the facts of

x vide Letter No 1095 of 17-2-'98 Serial No 37 File B.

of the case and also that petitions
were received from both Nanjammah
and Raghupatiah setting forth
their claims to the lands attached
to the Shanbhogee; that the latter
was informed by Amildar as per
instructions of the 2nd Asst Commr:
that as his appeal was time-barred
it could not be admitted and
that the Amildar in his report
No 981 d/ 20-6-'95 stated that the
lands in question were service
Inam Lands and so Candidate
lost claim to them when he lost
office also.

(74) On 10.5.'95 Nanjammah
submitted a petn to Govt complaining × vide Abstract of Petn No 3302.
of the delay in the disposal of her
petn d/ 16.3.'93 to the Dy Commr:
praying that her Hakdari
Shanbhogee of Kosanur might
be registered in the name of
her grandson Ramamurthi
and protesting against the appoint-
-ment of a stranger.
The petn was forwarded to the × vide G.O. $\frac{Rev}{1702}$ d/ 28.5.'95.
Dy Commr: for disposal calling
his attention to the statement that
the appeal had been long pending
before him.
This was forwarded to the 2nd × vide Memo No 4476 S.No 28 Dt File.
Gl Asst Commr: who called for × vide order No 10309 d/ 26.6.'95 in the above.
a report from the Amildar.

(75) On 23.7.'95 the Amildar
in reply stated that the Shanbhogee × vide Report No 79 S.No 28 Dt File.
of the village in question was as desired
by the Registrar Ramiah's wife,
registered

12

registered in the name of her daughter's son Appaiayya in accordance with Dt. order No 397 of 14-8-'91 and that the records connected therewith were submitted to the Dist. with Reply No 532 of 18-8-91.

x vide Abstract of Petn No 3123

D

(76) On 1-3-96 Nanjammah submitted another Petn to Govt praying that the Dy Commr: may be directed to dispose of her case early.

x vide O.M. Petn/1719 of 14-3-96

D

(77) This also was forwarded x to the Dy Commr: enquiring whether the appeal filed in March '93 was still pending and if so why.

x vide Yadi No 498 on S. No 41 Old File.

x vide Yadi No 581 of 12-2-98 on the above.

(78) Correspondence ensued in order to find out where the records of the case were, and on 19-1-'98 they were sent by the Dy Commr: to the Offg Asst Commr: who returned x them to the Dy Commr. as per his request.

x vide Petn No 1764 S. No 34 File B.

(79) On 4-1-'98 Nanjammah submitted a x Petn to Govt: complaining that full effect had not been given to the Dy Commr's order No 206 of 22-6-91 and praying that the Shanbhogue of Siddikoraikte and Doddaiere also might be registered in the name of Ramamurthi in addition to that of Gopalaiah now registered.

x vide Petn No 1765 S. No 35 File B.

(80) On the same day another Petn was submitted by Nanjammah and Ragunathayya

jointly urging their claim for the Shanbhogue of Nosame, Anekal Taluk on the following grounds:— 17

(1) The Registered Ramiah has no children.

(2) Even if he has, they or their sons are not entitled to the office in accordance with the Chief Commr's Circular orders.

(3) That the present officiator is a stranger.

(4) That they are Hissedars and Hakdars

and prayed that the Office might be registered in the name of Ramamurthi.

These petns were also forwarded x to the Dy Commr, who in reply referred x to his Letter No. 205 d/ 17-2-98.

x vide O.M. Pet/F39-94 d/ 15-2-98 S No 35 File B.

x vide Letter No. 205 d/ 18-2-98 S. No 38 File B.

---

(81) The file also contains papers relating to Raghupathiah's complaint regarding the non-return of a certain document.

On 14-8-93 Raghupathiah for the 1st time complained x of the non-return of a document (Pharikat Varkas 4) filed by him in Rev: O.S. No. 7 of 1869-70 on the file of the European Asst Supdt's Court Bangalore, though applied for since 1889. He also submitted x several reminder petitions, some of which were forwarded

x vide R.P. No 484 S. No 1 File B.

x vide S. Nos 6, 10, 16, 17, 18, 20, 24 & 26 File B.

forwarded to the Dy Commr. for early disposal.

(82) The case in which the petr. wished to have produced the said document came on for decision on appeal before the Chief Commr. in 1870-71. After the decision was passed the records of the case were sent on to the Supdt. Nundidroog Dn with this Office No ×4105/102 d 11-11-70.

× vide copy of docket S. No 2 File A.

D (83) On 19-10-'93 the Dy × Commr. represented the unsatisfactory state of records in the offices of himself and his subordinates

× vide Letter No 499 S. No 4 File B.

(84) The partition deed whose return was prayed for, was found with the case Nundidroog office records kept in the Dewan's office.

D (85) On 24·11·'96 an Endt × was issued to petr. informing him that a copy of the Tharikhat had to be kept in the file and directing him to produce the necessary stamp and fees for the preparation of that copy before taking back the original.

× vide Endt No 458 S. No 27 File B.

D (86) The petr. produced the necessary stamp and fee and on 30·3·'97 the original Tharikhat was returned to him after keeping a copy in the file.

15 . 11 . 11 97 [illegible]

20/3/98.

In the Dy Commr's report it is stated that the 1st petr Raghupataya first appealed in 1892 against the order of dismissal passed in 1877. The records in this office (vide File A) show that this statement is unfounded & is owing to the ~~loss~~ confused state of certain records referred to in Dy Commr's letter no 499 of 19/10/93 (serial no 4 of File B).

To this state of the records must also be ascribed the strange endorsement of the Dy Commr which does not enter fully into the claims advanced by the petr to 1/2 the service Inam land of Sidehosakote & Doddakere Shanbogi.

The following points seem to be fairly clear.

~~~~There are~~ Of the four villages Side Hosakote, Doddakere, Nosenur & Gollahalli, the 1st two seem to have formed one charge & the 3rd & 4th villages another charge since 1878.~~

P.T.O
~~~~


Raghunathayya (original member)
Buchi Raghupathayya (2nd Son) (deceased)
Papayya (deceased)
Chidhambarayya (deceased)
Ramayya (deceased)
No issue.
Buchi Raghupathayya (elder Son)
Dodda Ramanna deceased
0
Papanna alias Raghupathiah 2nd Son & planter of Papapatheggar Tope.
Chickaramanna (3rd Son)
Ramachendrayya (adopted Son)
Subbarayya (2nd Son & respondent dismissed from service in 1872)
Ramayya (1st Son) respondent dismissed from service in 1873.
Ramabhadrayya (2nd Son) deceased
Ramaswami (1st Son) (deceased)
Ramabhadrayya
Ramakrishnayya (2nd Son)
No issue.
Papanna (3rd Son) (deceased)
No issue.
Raghupathiah 4th Son (deceased)
Ramakrishnayya (deceased)
No issue.
Raghupathayya (1st Son)
Doddaramanna
Chickaramanna (2nd Son)
Ramabhadrayya (2nd Son) (deceased & issueless) husband of ✓Nanjamma
Ramayya (1st Son)
✓Raghupathiah. 2nd Pltff
Ramamurthi. 1st Pltff

5

19

decided the Succession to
the Shanbogi office
of Hosakote & Dodda Amanik

As regards the 2nd claim,
it appears from the certified
copies of the Asst. Supt's
& the Supt's Judgments of 1870
the originals are not
forthcoming — that the
2nd petr. is a hereditary
to the Shanbogi hukk
of the 2 villages and its
perquisites.

Since the passing of these
Judgments, the Potgi Rules
— having the force of law —
were passed in 1874 and
declare that the cash emolumen
of the office are payable
only to the officiator & that
& the official Land (or [illegible]

will remain in the possession of the sharers who may at present hold it" (Vide Secns XXXVII & XXVIII)

Now the 1st petr asserts that he was placed in possession of ½ the Service Inam Lands in pursuance of the decree of 1870 & that he ~~lost~~ was dispossessed of them in 1877 when he was dismissed

This assertion is not credible as the Potyp Rules of 1874 do not ~~direct~~ authorize dispossession of Service Inam Lands & as the records show that the local authorities understand the 1st petr to ask for the execution of the decree of 1870 in 1894

The Dy Commr who stated that the case would be disposed of on the merits has however dismissed the whole claim as time-barred. He has not found whether as a matter of fact the 1st petr was in possession of ½ the Service Inam Lands between 1870 & 1877 and if so whether he was dispossessed of them in 1877

In 1870 one Subraya was the Shanbog of Adihosakote & Doddakere, his elder brother Ramaya was the Shanbog of Vosenur & the 1st petr Raghupalah was the Shanbog of Gollahalli

In the years 1871 & 1872 Subbaraya & Ramaya were dismissed for certain alterations & erasures in the Collection Book. They [illegible] ~~Comm declined to interfere~~ on appeal (vide extract from the Collection Book in the A file)
The local authorities intended to appoint the ~~son of~~ sister's son of Subbaraya in succession but the 1st petr (Raghupalaya) represented that he was the nearest heir of the dismissed Shanbogues & was appointed Shanbogue of the ~~three~~ (two) villages in question (in addition to that of Gollahalli) on probation in June 1874

In 1877 the 1st petr was dismissed by the Dy Commr from the Shanbogueship of the ~~three~~ 3 villages for various offences. Both the Commr & the Chief Commr declined to interfere (Serial No 7 of A file of this office)

For the discharge of the Shanbogi duties, one Surappa was

(7

appointed gumasta for the two villages Sidehosakote & Doddakere, while the Shanboges of Bommandehalli was asked to look after the duties of Nosenur+ ~~&~~ Gollahalli

+ & in of 1 villages Nosenur Gollahalli

This was sanctioned as a temporary arrangement liable to be revised at the Survey settlement.

In 1882 the Dewan directed upon the representation of Subbaraya, the dismissed Shanbog of Sidehosakote & Doddakere, that the appointment of Sirappa should be limited to 10 years after which the claims of Subbaraya's heirs should be considered

In 1887 the above proceedings were given effect to by registering Ramachendra adopted son of Subbaraya as the Shanbog of the 2 villages.

18

As regards the Shanbogs of the other ~~the~~ villages Hosemane & Gollahalli, the Dy Commr in his order d 24/6/91 directed the registry of Ramamurti son of the 1st petr as Shanbogue & the discharge of duties by a gumasta during the minority of the Registerdar

=

The petrs now claim

(1) That Ramamurti should be registered as the Shanbog of Hosakote & Dodda Amanikere } urged by the 2nd petr as guardian of Ramamurti (though it is not clear how 2nd petr can be guardian while the father is living)

(2) That 1/2 the service Inam land attached to the Shanbogship mentioned should be placed in possession of the 1st petr } urged by the 1st petr as Registerdar to the Shanbogi

The grounds for the 1st claim are that the Dy Commr's order d 24/6/91 extended to all the four villages while effect was given only as regards 2 villages.

This claim is absurd as the Govt had along ago

The subject-matter of the appeal comes under Para X of the Rules of Business of 1895 (or para III of the present Rules of Business). ~~is~~

The case may either be posted for hearing or if the Councillor so pleases the appeal may be rejected under (2)(d) of Para X of the Rules of Business ~~of~~ of 1895

5/4/98

P.S. If the case is to be posted for hearing, further information on the following points seems necessary

(1) The no of charges with the potgis thereto into which the four villages were divided at the Pakka Potgi settlement (Survey settlement was introduced in 1891)

(2) Extract from the Settlement Register showing the arrangements made at the settlement for these 4 villages

5/4/98

(1) Why does Nanjamma style herself the guardian of Ramamurthy who has his father living?

(2) What is the subject-matter of the claim?

~~10155-98~~

25

When this appeal No. 18 of 98 came on for hearing Mr Vakil Ramniklal [illegible] for applt. expressed his inability to state clearly the grounds upon which the present claim was preferred so as to justify Govt. interference in matters finished several years ago - He [illegible] allowed time to file a written statement which he failed to do - The appeal must therefore be rejected as groundless

15/11/98

This has to go [illegible] Collector for appl

15/11

17/11/98

Sub to 2nd Councillor

16/11/98

18/11/98

Endt rejecting the petn 18/11/98

Endt [illegible]
Blue
18/11

Before the Government of Mysore.

Appeal No. 91 of 1898-99.

Appellants	Vs.	Respondents
(1) Ramamurti		(1) Ramachandraiya
(2) Raghupathaiya		(2) Appajaiya.

3 · 7 · 99.

Notices served on Respondents.
Appts' notices sent by post registered.

Applts & Respts present.

Mr D Venkataramia appears for applts.

Advocate – Shanbogi of Amanikere, Sidihoskote & Nosenur form the subject-matter of the appl. Adoption set up by the respts false. ~~[illegible] 1876.~~ In 1887 the 1st respt was recognised ~~[illegible]~~ by Govt as the adopted son of Sattarayya. By his claims to the 1st 2 villages recognised. I am now in possn of Gollahalli under an order of the Dy Commr. Even though I (Ramamurti) was registered as hukdar of Nosenur & Gollahalli, I was not put in possn of Nosenur. ~~1st respt~~ 2nd appt was the hukdar of all the 4 villages & ought not to get the registry of all the 4 villages

Vl ——

Revenue of Gollahalli is abt 250 while the revenue of
the other villages are much larger. The respts are also in
possn of the service Inams wh property belongs to the App
The offence committed by Raghupatayya is not serious. He wants
in the Shanbogs of Sidhoskote & Amanikere

Appajayya — I am the grandson of Ramaiya: Hosenur-Golla
is different from Hosenur & Gollahalli & is a single village

Ramachandrayya — I am not aware that all the 4
were regd in the name of Raghupata

1st Cr — A lenient view has been taken by giving Golla
~~for~~ to Narsamma who gave it to Ramam
All (. Ramayya, Subbarayappa & Raghupatayya.
hukdars.

2nd Cr — If Subbarayya had not been dismissed, Ragh
would not have ~~got~~ become Shanbog of
Sidhoskote & Amanikere.

Rejected
23/7/89.

Mysore Dewan's Office
Dated Bangalore 7 October 1898

26

Notice

Petitions Nos 1390 & 1764 of 1897–98

Petitioners
(1) Raghupatiaiya
(2) Ramamurti, minor by guardian Nanjamma } Represented by Mr D. Venkataramaiya, Advocate

To

D. Venkataramaiya Esqr. B.A., Advocate
Bangalore.

You are hereby requested to file in this Office within a fortnight from the date of receipt of this notice a statement of facts in the above case setting forth the cause of action and the relief claimed, failing which the petitions will be rejected

By order
for Secretary

As Mr. Venkataramaiya has gone to Tumkur, I have received the copy for him.
clerk
10/10/98

Before the Government of Mysore.

29

Appeal No. 91 of 1897-98.

Appellants	Vs.	Respondents
(1) Ramamurti, minor, by guardian Nanjamma (2) Raghupatiraya		(1) Ramachandraiya (2) Appajaiya

Subject:— Claim to the Shanbhogi offices of Sidihoskote, Anandoddakere and Nasenur in the Anekal Taluk.

Reposted for hearing on 3rd July 1899.

11618 [illegible] 28/6/99

Vide Govt. order

1st appt. absent & Respts. in person

[illegible]

[illegible] Office Please postpone the hearing of this case & [illegible] of appeal & [illegible]

3-7-99-

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 3

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1-11-93

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

J.R. 116-93-1

3542-70.

4349/93

(General Serial No. 32.)

1893

No. 171 (3)

Name of Petitioner Nagalingaiah Shanbhog of Yelichenahalli & others

Village.
Taluk. Civil & Military Station
District. Bangalore

Date of Arzi. 5-10-93

Date of Receipt. 5-10-93

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Six

ABSTRACT.

Appealing against the Deputy Commissioner's order, no. 56, dated 19th September 1893, asking him to file a suit in the Civil Courts for the recovery of his half-share in the Inam lands of Shanbhogi office of Dodkere, Anekal taluk, on the grounds that his claim is directly confirmed in the decision passed by 1st [illegible]

Civil Court

Assistant Superintendent, Bangalore Dt. 5
~~Division~~ in the Revenue Original No: 7
of 1870 & in the decision passed by
the Superintendent, Nundidroog
Division in the Special Appeal
suit No. 17 of 1870-71, that while
his suit is confirmed, it is unjust
to ask him to go to the Civil Court
again on the ground that the former
suit is only for mesnes; that in
the decree of the above Court it is
ordered that the costs should be
borne by the opposite party which
also proves his claim; & that no special
orders were asked when the [illegible]
of Golahalli Inam lands referred to in
the above decision were restored,
~~to him~~ while they ask special orders
for restoring the Inam lands of Doddakere.

Prays for an order to the
Deputy Commissioner for the
restoration of the said Inam lands.

12/10

B

Petn Br
mins/10/93.

No 20

32

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
RECD. N. 4711
DATE 15-10-93

42

S. No.
93 94

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

3 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 34

[illegible]

[illegible] 139 [illegible] 22 [illegible] 434 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

3 [illegible]

4 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Pet
757

36

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE, 21-11-93

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

(5)

The accompanying Petition No. 971 dated 5. 10. 93 received at the Dewan's Office from Raghupataiya Civil and Military Station Bangalore, appealing against the Deputy Commi Order No. 50 of 15th Sept: 93, regarding certain Shanbhog ~~[illegible]~~ Service Inam lands is forwarded, together with its six enclosures, to the Deputy Comm Bangalore District for submission of the proceedings with a report on the facts of the case and on the points ~~taken~~ urged in the petition.

The petition with the enclosures should be returned.

L. Rev 116-9-2

By Order,

Draft

BANGALORE, 15 Nov 1893.

For Chief Secretary.

S.V.
15/11

To [illegible] 2880 / 93

6/12

37

To the [illegible] in continuation of Offr No [illegible]/757 dated 21 inst

9/12

L. R. 116-93-3

(General Serial No. 32.)

1893. [illegible]

No. 1477 (7)

Name of Petitioner. Raghupathie, Sh

Village. } C & M Station

Taluk. } Bangalore

District.

Date of Arzi. 2-12-93

Date of Receipt. 4-12-93

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil

ABSTRACT.

Requesting that the D
Commissioner may
to have the produce of hi
Shanbhogki Inami land
in stock separately till the
disposal of his appeal
this office

6/12

3/888

3/24 20-05

13-12-

38

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM. (8)

L.R. 116-93-4

The accompanying Petition No. 1479 dated 2. 12. 93 received at the Dewan's Office from Shanbhog Raghupataiya, Civil and Military Station Bangalore, praying that pending disposal of his appeal regarding certain Shanbhogi Inam lands, the produce of the lands may be placed in deposit is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosures~~, to the Deputy Commr, Bangalore District, in continuation of Official Memorandum No Rel/757 dated 21st ultimo.

By Order,

Draft 9/12

for Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE, 8
Dec 1893

Sc 9/12

M. G. C. P. Bangalore.—21-11-92—3,000.

39

(25)

1896

No.	1457
Name of Petitioner	[illegible]
Village	[illegible] No. 122
Taluk	Seppings Road C & M S.
District	Bangalore
Date of Arzi	11 - 11 - 96
Date of Receipt	16 - 11 - 96.
Date of Disposal	
No. of Enclosure	nil

Submitted with references
Please see also
office note & draft endorsement
submitted for approval.
and Petn No. 1458 11-11-96
~~[illegible]~~

17/11

~~[illegible]~~ [Since read Sheristedar's note on the petition]

L.R. 116-93-5

ABSTRACT.

States that on 24-7-94 he was passed Endorsement No. 3114 intimating the despatch of the papers relating to his appeal preferred to Govt on 5-10-93 to the Dy. Commr for disposal - that the Dept. has been referred to the [illegible] for getting that the file sent to the [illegible] is not forth-coming - that consequently the disposal of his case has been delayed. Prays that early orders may be passed to the district to search for the missing records.

16/11.

Pet
7.39-94 2 drafts (one Eng +
one Kan)

Leo

2l

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE. 774

PETITION DEPARTMENT. (28)

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying ~~Appeal~~ Petition Registered No. 1457 dated 11-11-96 received at the Dewan's Office from

Raghupathayya Civil & Military Station Banga-lore regarding certain Shanbhogi Inam lands in the Anekal Talk

L.R. 116-93-6

is forwarded, together with his petiti ~~enclosure~~, Regd. no 971 dat 5th October 1893 and it 6 enclosures, to the Deputy Commr. Bangalore Dist for early attention, in Con-nuation of this office no Pet/39-94 dated 1-4-96.

By order,

Draft 25/11/96

BANGALORE, 189 } ~~For~~ Secretary.

25-11-96

Reference 2/11/97

2033 [illegible] P.F. No 39-94.

[illegible]
3-11

Genl: Rs.

Please put up the above file

4/11/97. The above file put up [illegible]

[illegible] 4/11/97

[illegible] 3/11/97.

Submitted

The office note in the file gives all the information - Petn No. 1457 of 11/11/95 was also sent to the Dy. Commr with Pet. 739-94 of 25/11/96 (Serial No 25) for early attention

BK
5/11/97

To DC in Contt

M 6/11/97

L.R. 116-93/7

(30)

41 1897

No. 1073

Name of Petitioner [illegible]
[illegible]

Village [illegible]
[illegible]

Taluk

District

Date of Arzi 21-10-97

Date of Receipt 27-10-97

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure nil

ABSTRACT.

In re Appeal case No 971
of 1893-94.

States that ~~[illegible]~~ he was informed by ind No 3124 dated 1-4-[illegible] stating that the records of the case were sent to the Dy Commr for disposal that he requested that until the disposal of the appeal the crop of the land in dispute might be kept in

Arianat and he was informed that it has been forwarded to the Govt. — that the case is still pending — that he is from the beginning and the records show urging that the lower Court has not understood the case properly.

Prayer (1) that the records be sent for and the case disposed of by Govt. (2) that pending final disposal of the appeal the crop be reserved.

4/11/87

(603) [illegible]

(31) Pet 739-94. P. 11-11-97

43

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

L. R. 116-93-8

The accompanying ~~Appeal~~ Petition Registered No. 1073 dated 21.10.97 received at the Dewan's Office from Raghupathi Shanbhog of Doddanekundalu in the Anekal tk, residing in ~~No 122, Sappings Road~~ ~~Civil and Military~~ Station Bangalore, praying for early disposal of his appeal regarding the Shanbhogi Inam lands and ~~for orders to keep the crops of the land in amani pending~~ disposal of the appeal is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosure~~, to the Deputy Commissioner of ~~the~~ Bangalore District, ~~for disposal~~. in continuation of this office No Pet 7.39.94 dated 25th November 1896.

By order,

M
for ~~Secretary.~~

BANGALORE,
11/11/1897
12

8/11/97

Presented in person to Ref. Branch 30/11/97

Raghupathiah
30-11-97
Khazanadar

No. 1390

No 42

Rlyg Record office Rent No 3/24 5/4/96 30/11/97

affixed

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REG'D. No. 13932
DATE 1/11/97

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 22 [illegible]

[illegible] 97 [illegible] 1060 [illegible]

[illegible]

1 [illegible] 77 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

2 1893 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

3 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

4 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 71 [illegible]

[illegible]

46

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 77 [illegible]

[illegible] 2 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 10 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 77 [illegible] 3 [illegible] 78 [illegible] 23 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 173 [illegible]

[illegible] 78 [illegible]

[illegible] 8/ [illegible]

[illegible] 16 [illegible] 3340 [illegible]

[illegible] 82 [illegible] 10 [illegible] 82 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 17 [illegible] 1886 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 2 [illegible]

[illegible] 87 [illegible] 3/5/ [illegible]

[illegible] 16 [illegible]

[illegible] 93 [illegible] 14 [illegible] 281 [illegible]

93 [illegible] 27 [illegible]

13 [illegible] 72 [illegible] 10 [illegible] 10 [illegible]

14 [illegible] 1891 [illegible] 22 [illegible] 206 [illegible]

15 [illegible]

16 [illegible]

[illegible] — 73 — 74 [illegible] 2/5 [illegible]

5 [illegible] 73 [illegible]

6 [illegible]

7 1873 [illegible]

8 [illegible]

9 [illegible]

10 [illegible] 76 [illegible] 22 [illegible] 1877 [illegible]

11 [illegible]

48

[illegible]

17 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

10 [illegible]

[illegible] 10 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1591 [illegible] 22 [illegible] 206 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 73-74 [illegible] 2/51 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 72-73 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 10-20 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 10 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 10 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 200 [illegible]

[illegible]

7

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] – 51

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1 [illegible] [illegible] 30 [illegible] 1897 [illegible]

2 [illegible] 3/24 [illegible]

3 [illegible] 73-74 [illegible] 2/5 [illegible]

4 [illegible]

5 15-8-77 [illegible]

6 [illegible]

7 21/11/77 [illegible]

8 [illegible] 74 [illegible] 30 [illegible]

9 [illegible] 2-8-77 [illegible]

Gen. Serial No. 32.]

1895

No. 3002

Name of Petitioner. Ramamma wife of Ramabhadria Hakkdar Shanbogue of Hosenur

Village. Anekal Taluk - residing

Taluk. in Door No. 81 Seppings Road - C&M. S. Bangalore

District.

Date of Arzi. 10 - 5 - 95

Date of Receipt. 11 - 5 - 95

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures.

Subd. to the Rev. Councillor
16/5

To the Dep. Comr. for disposal calling his attention to the statement that the appeal has been long pending before him.
18/5/95

Drafted
SKR.
23/5

L.R. 116-93-

ABSTRACT.

States that her [illegible] Rama, who was Shanbogue of Hosenur and dismissed the service, died issueless - that the office was conferred on a stranger without her knowledge though she was an Hakkdar -, that she submitted a petition to the Amildar representing that the appointment was not proper and that her grandson Ramamurti - a minor should be appointed - that in reply she was granted an endorsement - that she then preferred an appeal to the Dy. Comr. on 16-3-9 & that it has not been disposed of as yet - Prays that the Dy. Comr. may be asked to dispose of the case soon and that she may also be granted an endorsement.

1764

Pet
1712

52

3075

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition Registered No. 3002 dated 10-5-95 received at the Dewan's Office from ~~[illegible]~~ Rangamma widow of Kalnirbawa ~~[illegible]~~ of [illegible] Anekal Taluk complaining of the delay in the disposal of her appeal ~~before~~ the Dy. Commr. regarding the [illegible] of [illegible]

is forwarded, ~~together with its~~ enclosure, to the Deputy Commissioner of the Bangalore District for disposal.

2. ~~[illegible]~~ The attention of the Dy Commr is drawn to the ~~[illegible]~~ statement in the petition that the appeal has been ~~long~~ pending before him since March 1893.

By order,

[illegible] 28/5/95

Under ~~Chief~~ Secretary.

BANGALORE,
18-5- 1895
30.

L.R. 116-93-9

Registered 26/5

M.G.C.P.B.—25-4-95—500

Box 54

Petition Branch
20/ A. F.
5-1-98

References
20.1.98

1390 of 97 R.F. 39 of 94-

21/1/98 RF 39 of 94 relating to the subject is put up

K
24/1/98
~~Indexed~~
Record
25.1.98

Please put up Endt No 3002 of 95 and 3120 of ~~1895~~ 1895 regarding the [illegible] connected papers

26.1.98

L.R. 116-93-11

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1719

[illegible]

[illegible]

The above & connected papers 28 1 98
Pet & connected papers
1719 put up
K 2/2/98

Sub.d with pet. No ~~[illegible]~~ 1767 [illegible] that pet. [illegible]
This relates to the [illegible]
[illegible] 1/2/98

Pet to be informed that [illegible] with the father of the pet.

To the Dy Comm.r ~~[illegible]~~ Pet. of 22/12/97 [illegible] F 39-94 8/2/98

[illegible]

(35)

189/8

No. 1765 * as guardian to Ramamoorthy (minor)

Name of Petitioner Nanjamma & * Raghupathiengar father of the minor

Village Door No. 122

Taluk Seppings Road, C. & M. Station

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 4-1-98

Date of Receipt 5-1-98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Three

ABSTRACT

State that their appeal No. 300 of 97 regarding the ~~[illegible]~~ 1/2 share in the Shanbhogue hak is still pending before Govt. – that Shanbhoge Ramaiya who was dismissed from service in 1874 for clandestine enjoyment of Govt. land secured the registry of Shanbhogue hak in the name of Ramachandraiya falsely representing that he was adopted by the former – that the said Ramachandraiya

died 10 years afterwards
that the appointment of
Ramachandraiya as Shanbhog
in preference to the claims of
the appellant, was opposed to
circular orders of the Chief
Commissioner; that they
managed the office of the Shanbhog
for 4 years after the death of
Ramchandraiya without bringing
either to the notice of Government or giving
information
to the appellants — appointing
one Appajappa, the brother, of the
deceased Ramchandraiya as
gumasta — that Nanjamma
the appellant, put forward her
claims in favour of her minor
son Rama Murti for Shanbhoga
hak in 1889 — that the respondents
managed to secure, somehow
the registry in the name of Gumasta
Appajappa in 1891 — that the appellants
applying for the office, they were informed
by the Amildar that Appajappa was
appointed as Shanbhog for maintain-
-ing the wife of dismissed Ramaiya —
that Ramaiya's wife died in Feby 98.
that they applied to the Dy Commr.
after the death of Ramaiya's wife
setting forth their claims, but

pees stamp affixed

COURT FEE

TWO RUPEES

192

4-1-98

57

5/1/98

ORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
TITION DEPARTMENT
D. No. 1765
E 5-1-98

ಮೈಸೂರು ಮಹಾರಾಜ ರಾಜಾಸಾಹೇಬ್ ಬಹದ್ದೂರವರ ದಿವಾನ್ ಜೀ
ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲರ್ ಅವರ ಹುಜೂರ್ ಅಧಿಕಾರಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ.

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಮಿಲ್ಟರಿ ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್ ಸಪಿಂಗ್ಸ್ ರೋಡ್ 122 ನೆ ನಂಬರು ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಆನೇಕಲ್ ತಾ॥ ಮೊಂಕೇನಹಳ್ಳಿ ಗ್ರಾ॥ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಕೈದುಕಸ್ತುದಾರ ಮೈನರ್ ರಾಮಯ್ಯನಿಗೆ ಗಾರ್ಡಿಯನ್ ಆದ ರಾಮಭದ್ರಯ್ಯ ನಡೆಂತಿರಿ ನಂಜಪ್ಪ, ರಘುಪತಯ್ಯ. ನಮ್ಮಗಳಿಂದ ಕೊಡಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ ಅಪೀಲ್–

ಸದರಿ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಶ್ಯಾನುಭೋಗಿಕೆ ನೋಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ರಾಮಯ್ಯನು ಏಕಸಾ 20 ವರುಷಗಳು ಸ್ವಾಂತ ಜಮೀನ್ ಅವರಾಯಿ ಇವುಗಳನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟಾಂತ ನೀವಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಇದ್ದದ್ದರು ಬಾಗಿ 74 ನೆ ಇಸ್ವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹುದ್ದೆನಿಂದ ಬರತರಫ್ ಆದನು. ಇವನ ತಮ್ಮ ಕಿರಿ ಹೊಸಹಳ್ಳಿ ವೆದಿಂತ್ರಿಕ್ಕೆ ಶಾನುಭೋಗಿಕೆ ನೋಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಸುಬ್ಬರಾಯ ಬಿಟ್ಟಾಂತ ನೀವಸಗೆ ರಾಜದ್ರೋಹ ಕೆಲಸಗಳು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರಿಂದ 72 ನೆ ಇಸ್ವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹುದ್ದೆನಿಂದ ಬರತರಫ್ ಆಗಿ ರಘುಪತಯ್ಯನೆಂಬವನು 77ನೆ ಇಸ್ವಿಯಿಂದ ತರಿವಿಹಾ ನಿಕಾರಿ ನೋಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದನು ಮೇಲೆ ಸದರಿ ಸುಬ್ಬರಾಯನೇ ನಾಹಕ್ಕುತಕ್ರಾರು ಕಬಾನಾನಿ ತಪ್ಪು ಭೂಂಜ ಕಂದು ಖಾನವಿಧ್ರಾಂದ ತಪ್ಪಿರನ್ ರಾಜಾ ಕದನನಿಗೆ ನೌಕರಿ ಬೇಕಿದ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ಹುಜೂರ್ ಜನಾಬಿನಲ್ಲಿ 97ನೆ ಇಸ್ವಿ 1390ನೇ ನಂಬರು ಅಪೀಲ್ ವ್ಯಾಜ್ಯವಿದೆ. ಸದರಿ ನೊಂಕೇನಹಳ್ಳಿ ಗ್ರಾಮಕ್ಕೆ ರಘುಪತಯ್ಯನೆಂದವನನ್ನೇ ಕಿಜ್ಜರು ಮಾಡ್ಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಿನ್ನಿಕ್ಕ ಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರಿಸದೆ ಅಪೀಲ್ ಶಲ್ಲಿಕೆಯಾದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ

ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ನಡೆಸಿ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರ್ ಮಾಡಿಸಿದ ಬಳಿಕ ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರ್ ಸಾಹೇಬ್ ರವರ ಪರ್ವಾನಗಿ

ದ್ವಾರ ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರನೆಂಬವನು ತನಗೆ ದತ್ತಾಗಿರುತ್ತಾನೆಂದು ನಂಜಕ್ಕನು ಇನಾಮು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದು

ಕನ್ನದೆ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯಾಗಿ 74ನೆ ಇಸ್ವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಮಯ್ಯನಿಗೆ ಅಕ್ರಮ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದನು —

ಆ ದತ್ತುಪುತ್ರನೆಂಬ ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರನು ಸುಮಾರು ಹತ್ತುವರುಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮೃತಪಟ್ಟನು —

ಹಕ್ಕುದಾರಳಾದ ನಂಜಮ್ಮನು ಮೈನರ್ ರಾಮಸ್ವಾಮಿ ನಾಯ್ಡುಗಳು ಹಾಜರಿದ್ದಾಗ

ಆಂಧ್ರಾ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯು ಆನಮ್ಮಗಳಿಗೆ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಮೂಲಕ ತಿಳಿಸಿದೆಯಾ ದತ್ತಾಗಿ ದ್ವಾರ

ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರ ಮೃತಪಟ್ಟನಂತರ 4 ವರುಷಗಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ತಿಳಿಸದೆಲೇ ಗೋಪ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊ

ಈ ಮೃತಪಟ್ಟ ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರನ ಅಣ್ಣ ಅಪ್ಪಾಜೀ ಗುಮಾಸ್ತೆಯೆಂದು ನಾನಾ ಕಲ್ಪನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು —

1889ನೆ ಇಸ್ವಿ ಆಗಾಗ ಇತರ ಮೈಸೂರ್ ರಾಮಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಅಗ್ರಹಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಶಾನುಭೋ

ವಿಕೆ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಿಗೆ ಇದ್ದಂತ ಹಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡುವದಕ್ಕೆ ನಂಜಮ್ಮನಿಗೆ ನಾನು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಪಟ್ಟೆನು. ಈ ಸಂಧ

ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರನನ್ನ ಕಳೆದು 1891ನೆ ಇಸ್ವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೇ ಗುಮಾಸ್ತೆ ಅಪ್ಪಾಜಿಗೆ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರ್ ಮಾಡಿದರು —

ಸದರಿ ಅಪ್ಪಾಜಿಗೆ ನಾವು ಹಕ್ಕು ಅಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರು ಮಾಡಿರುವುದನ್ನು ರದ್ದು ಮಾಡಿ

ರಾಮಸ್ವಾಮಿಗೆ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು 1896ನೆ ನವಂಬರು 6ರಲ್ಲಿ ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮಿಷ

ರಲ್ಲಿ ನಂಜಮ್ಮನವರ ನಾವು ಫಿರ್ಯಾದಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೇಲೆ ರಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ

ಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅದೇ ಮಾಹೆ 12ನೆ ಮುಸ್ಕಾಮೆ 215ನೆ ನಂಬರು ಇಂತಾ ರೂಪಕ

ಡಿದರು. ಆ ವರದಿ ತಿಳುವಳಿಕೆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ 91ನೆ ನವಂಬರು 23ರಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಯ 3ಗೆ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟು

ಕ್ಕೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಖಾದರ ಯವ್ವನದ ಕೊತ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಪೋಷಣೆ ಮಾಡುವದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅಪ್ಪಾಜಿ

but the matter is still pending disposal before the District authorities in spite of Govt. Endorsements Nos: 3002 of 18-5-95 & 3120 of 7-8-96 ~~of 96~~ ~~[illegible]~~ that they have references to prove that the appellants are claimants for a moiety of hak - The grounds of appeal are:- (1) That Ramaiya has no issue, (2) That he is not eligible for the office under the authority of the Chief Commr's Circular, Even though he had sons - (3) That under the circumstances of Ramaiya's dismissal Even his grandsons are not competent for the office - (4) & that the present office holder Appajappa is a perfect stranger and as such is not entitled to the Shanbhagee hak

Pray that equitable orders may be passed with reference to the records -

CR
19/1/98

[illegible]

59

[illegible] —

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 3,20 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] —

[illegible]

[illegible] 4 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 24 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] —

1. [illegible] —
2. [illegible]

[illegible]

3. [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

4. [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

61 Pet/F39-94 P2 (36) (1021) [illegible] 15-2-98

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTM

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

L.R. 116-93-12

The accompanying Appeal Petitions Registered No~~s~~. ~~1764~~ 1765 and dated 4-1-98, received at the Dewan's Office from (1) Vanjamma mother and guardian to Ramamurti minor son of Shanthy Ramabhadriah, (2) himself and Raghupatiaya resid in house No 122 Seppings Road Civil and Military station Bangalore praying for the registry of the Shanbogue of Siddi Anaive Vinayi devin Keye village and of Nosamur village for each village respectively in the Hoska Taluk ~~are~~ forwarded, together with ~~its~~ their four enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner of Bangalore District, for disposal in continuation of this office No Pet/F39-94 dated 22-12-97.

By order,

Secretary.

BANGALORE,
15th February 1898
15

Dy

12/2/98

62 (37)

6069
Pet 448

1897-98

From The Dy. Commissioner
Bangalore District.

To ~~The~~ The Secretary to the Govt
of Mysore
Genl & Rev Department.

Dated 17th } February 1898
Despatched 18th }
Received
General No.
D No. 1095.

Enclosure No. file

Secy's Offl Memo No. Pet 739-94 of the 22nd December 1897

Submits full report with the entire proceedings in petition from Ragapathia appealing against the order of his dismissal passed 20 years ago as time barred

Pet
21/2/98

Recd
24/2

07 397-94 on the Subject is put up
Sub with Dy Cr's No. D 1098 of 18-2-98
Ak.
25/2/98
MQ
25/2/98

Precis (early)
My 28/2/98

Mr C. E. Ramachar.
~~[illegible]~~ 2/3/98

Precis put up
CR

L.R. 116-93-13

Recd 26/3/98
Submitted to 3rd Councillor with precis
28/3/98 mf

My 5/4/98

Recd. 5.4.98

Registers not available

Notice to issue to the petr for being heard by the Rev Cr. EDR
(Let the drafting clerk take instructions from me as to the wording)

[illegible]
My 22/5/98

~~Notice~~ Copied
Ak Notice issued to Petr to appear on the 21st June 98.
N 26/5/98

of Sidi Hosakote, was convicted of theft in a criminal case in 1877-78 and the Amildar of Anekal recommended his dismissal from the office (vide report No. 465 of the 25th July 1877). The Shanbhog was dismissed by the then 1st General Asstt Commissioner, Mr. W. Porteous, on the 15th August 1877, as per order No. 507, and the Amildar was asked to appoint a successor. The Amildar reported that there were several claimants, all of whom were entangled in some way or the other and so recommended that the shanbhogi may be registered in the name of Lakshman Rao, son-in-law of Subrayappa, brother of Raghupatayya for the villages of Sidi Hosakote and Amani Doddakere, and in the name of Ramamurti, grandson of Nanjamma, wife of a deceased uncle of Raghupatayya, for the village of Nosenur Gollahally. It was finally decided that Nanjamma had claims to only Nosenur Gollahally the shanbhogi of which village was registered in the name of her grandson at her request (vide order No. 230 of the 30th June 1891).

3. The order of dismissal of Raghupatayya was passed in 1877 and the records show that the first appeal against this order was made in November 1892. [illegible] The case was under enquiry, but petitions were received from both Raghupatayya and Nanjamma, setting forth their claims to the lands attached to the Shanbhogi. Raghupatayya was informed by the Amildar, as per instructions

D. No 1095.
Encs. file

Bangalore District
Dy. Commissioner's Office
Bangalore, 1898.

63

To,

The Secretary
to the Government of Mysore
Revenue and General Department.

Sir,

Adverting to your official Memorandum No $\frac{\text{Oct}}{\text{F. 39-94}}$ of the 22nd December 1897 calling for the records and a report regarding the claim of Raghupatayya, ex-Shanbhog of the Hosakote, Banani Dodda Kere and Norenur Gollahalli in the Anekal taluk, for the lands attached to the office of Shanbhog, I beg to submit herewith the entire records together with the enclosures of the reference under reply and to state as follows:-

2. Raghupatayya, Shanbhog

c/ petn No 1012 & file.

1898

No. 1033

Name of Petitioner: Rama Murthi minor by
amma, + Raghupathi
Through their advocate
D. Venkataramay

Village

Taluk: Bangalore

District

Date of Arzi: -11- 98

Date of Receipt: 3- 12- 98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure: Nil

L.R. 116-93-14

This petition is signed by D. Venkataramay
advocate for Pe

ABSTRACT

Petitioner		Counterpetiti
1. Rama Murthia minor by Guardian Nanjamma & 2 Raghupathia	~~vs~~	1 Ramach Offg. Shanbog. Ammanan Do Kerai & 2 Appajaya Shanbhog. Nasa

The petitioners submit an amended petition in continuation of their appea petitions of 4-1-98, 30-11-97, 4-1-

Stating

(1) That the subject of dispute is in r the Shanbhogues of Dodakere Amani Ke Siddi Hosekotte, and Nasanoor,

(2) That the 2nd Counter petr is lookin after the duties of the Shanbhogue of Nas and the 1st is working as Shanbhog of t rest,

(3) That the I Counter petitioner a strang to the Ank is no longer entitled to hold the office,

· That the adoption pleaded by the I Counter petitioner is fictitious and not true

· that the I Counter petitioner's predecessor in title forfeited his right by his conduct and which was taken away from during the Chief Comr's, time,

· that the orders obtained subsequently seem to have been obtained without proper enquiry,

· that the 2nd Petitioner was appointed to perfo[illegible] the duties after the dismissal of [illegible]ubraya

· that the complaints of theft & misappropriation alleged against him were preferred by Subraya himself, of which the former related to the lopping off the branches of a tree which belonged to the 2nd Petr: and that the latter was purely imaginary,

that a Sirkar Gumasta worked for 10 years when the 2nd Counter petr & Subraya were both deprived of their offices,

that the 1st Counter petr: got into office ~~was appoint~~~~ed~~ by means of misrepresentation,

that the Nasamoor Shanbhoguee was looked after by Ramaya ~~from~~ till 1874 ~~& 76 when he died~~, when he was dismissed, that a Gumasta was appointed by Govt for that office who worked till 1887, that the widow of Ramaya died in 1893, leaving no issue,

that the petitioners are the heirs of the deceased Ramaya on the male side

that the 2nd Counter Petr is a ~~str~~ stranger not related to the deceased

that the right of the petitioners is established by the decree in their favour in Suit no 46/1857 of the

[illegible]

66

of the 2nd Asstt Commissioner in his endorsement No. 104 of the 24th August 1903, that as his appeal was time-barred, it could not be admitted. The 2nd Asstt Commissioner of the district further forwards the report of the Amildar of the Arkal Taluk (No. 981 of the 20th June 1905), stating that the lands in question are service inam lands and S. Raghupatayya lost claim to them when he lost the office also.

4. As the appeal of Raghu=patayya was time-barred, he was informed of it in this office endorse=ment No. 1060 of the 21st November 1907, that nothing can be done at present and that if his dismissal was wrong, he ought to have appealed then and there.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

A. Narsimiengar
Asstt Commissioner
in District charge
For Deputy Commissioner

64 |

Pet No: 1033

15 that the charges brought against the Second Petr are very trivial and not of a nature as to deprive him of the Huk and

16 ~~that they have~~ he has been deprived of the office for ~~8~~ 22 years,

The petitioners pray,

that the second petitioner may be restored to office, that the previous orders on the subject may be held to apply to the 2nd Petr only during his life, and not to affect his heirs (as the Govt has decided in Suits in re of hereditary offices,) that the wrong interpretation put by the Talook ~~interpretation~~ authorities in re to half of the Huk in the offices in question may be removed, and that the lands & produce may be allowed to be shared in the manner provided for by the decree in S. No: 46 of 57, that even though the 2nd Petitioner is ~~[illegible]~~ ~~do not~~ not given the office the 1st Petitioner at least may be ordered to get & that the Counter Petrs: who are mere strangers may be directed to establish their claim in a Law Court in respect to the adoption they set up.

L.S.G.
9. 12. 98

1033

Rep
to Peta Branch
3/12/98

8/12/98

To

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore
Revenue & General Departments
Bangalore

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REGD. No 1033 R.
DATE 3-12-98

Revenue Petition No 108.C

Petitioners	Counter Petrs.
1. Rama Murthi minor by Guardian Nanjamma. (15 years of age (born in [illegible]) 29.5.99 2. Raghupathi.	1. Ramachandriya Officiating Shanboque of Amani Doddakere in Siddi Hoscotta, Anekal Talook. 2. Appajia, Officiating Shanboque of Nasainoor, Anekal Talook.

The Petitioners respectfully beg ~~to~~ submit the amended petition in continuation of their appeal petitions of 4th Jany 98, 30th Novr 97, and 4th Jany 898, respectively:—

1. That the Shanboque offices regarding which the disputes exist between the Petitioners and the Counter-Petrs are those of Doddakere Amani tank,

to the lopping off the branches of a tree which belonged to the 2d. Petr. and that the latter was purely imaginary.

9. That the 2d. Counter Petr. and Subroya were both deprived of office for a period of 10 years during which period a Sirkar Gumasta was performing the duties.

10. That the 1st Counter Petr. got into the office to the prejudice of both the Petrs. by means of mis-representation.

11. That the Office of Nasamoor village was held by one Ramaya who died about the year 1876 two years after his dismissal from Office which took place in the year 1874. After Ramaiya's death a Gumasta appointed by Govt. held the office till 1887. The widow of Ramaiya who was the surviving heir died in 1893 leaving no issue.

12. That the Petitioners are the heirs on the male side to the deceased Ramaiya.

13. That the 2d. Counter Petr. is a Stranger and the relationship set up by him is all untrue.

14. That the Hak of the Petitioners

is established by the Decree in their
favour in Suit No. 46/1857 on the
file of the Principal, Sudder Munsiff's
Court, Bangalore Division.

15. The Petitioners' present prayers
are as follows:—

(a). That the charges brought aga
the 2d. Petr. were of such a trivial
nature as not to deprive him of the
Huk.

(b) That the 2d. Petr. may be restor-
ed to office taking into conside
-ation the long period viz 22 yea
during which he has been ou
of office.

(c) That the previous orders o
the subject may be held to app
to the 2d. Petr. only during his li
time and not to affect his he
as the Govt. has been graciously
doing recently in their decision
regarding hereditary offices.

(d) That the wrong interpretation
put by the Talook Authorities to
regard to half of the Huk in
offices in question may be remov
and that the lands and produ
may

Siddi Horeotta and Nasaimoor.

2. That the 1st Counter-Petr is now performing the duties of Doddakere Amani Tank and of Siddi Horeotta and that the 2nd Counter Petr is performing the duties of Nasaimur.

3. That the 1st Counter Petr is a stranger to the Huk and as such he is not entitled to continue to hold the office.

4. That the adoption pleaded by the 1st Counter-Petr is fictitious and not true.

5. That the 1st Counter-Petrs predecessor in title forfeited his Huk by his conduct and was deprived of the same during the time of the late Chief Commissioner.

6. That any orders obtained subsequently seem to have been obtained without proper enquiry.

7. That after the dismissal of Subroya the 2nd Petitioner was appointed to perform the duties.

8. That the complaints alleged against him 1/3 of theft and misappropriation were preferred by Subroya himself, the former of which related to

3/ may be permitted to be shared in the manner provided for in the Decree in Suit No 46 of 1857.

(a) That in the event of the Govt not taking a merciful view of the 2nd Petrs' case, the 1st Petitioner may be given the offices.

(b) That the Counter-Petitioners who are strangers and are performing the duties as officiators may be directed to establish their claim in a Civil Court regarding the so called adoption set up by them.

Bangalore
November 1898.

D. Venkataramaiya
Advr: for Petrs.

75

1899

No. 1338

Name of Petitioner Raghupatiaya & others

Village } No: 122. Sepings Road Civil & Military Station

Taluk } Bangalore

District }

Date of Arzi 8. 2. 99

Date of Receipt 8. 2. 99

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure 10

Refce
15.2.99
25. P.M.

No 32 of 99 & P.R. 57 of 94.

Reg'd
17/2/99

The above file is put up.

AK
17/2/99

L.R. 116-93-15

Application for the re-admission of an appeal dismissed for default of a statement being filed within the prescribed period.

The statement was filed on 3/12/98 (S No 41) & the appeal dismissed on 17/11/98

Sub^d to 2nd Councillor
21/2/99

R 37. 3 ...
21.2.99

The plague has furnished a universal excuse. If the 1st Councillor has no objn I would give another opportunity to the petr.
22/2/99

1921

Sub^d to 1st Councillor
24/2/99

ABSTRACT

With reference to Govt Endt. No. 18.11.98 the petitioners state that their Advocate Mr. D. Venkataramanaiya promised to present a statement of appeal, that his (advocate's) father died in the meantime, that owing to plague he went away in July to Tumkur, that he (petitioner) therefore submitted a petition in November 1898 praying for 3 months' time, that it appears that the said petition was returned as being unstamped, that though the said petition has not as yet reached them they present this duly stamped, that Mr. D. Venkata Ramaiya says that he has

S.L. ~~H~~.

1338

Two Rs stamp affixed [illegible]

74.

[illegible]
6-2-99
[illegible]

77 Bot [illegible] Branch
8/2/99

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REG'D. NO 1338 R
DATE 8-2-99

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] /22 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1897 [illegible] 1390 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 98 [illegible] 18 [illegible]

[illegible] 25 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 28 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

57 [illegible] 46 [illegible]

[illegible] 73 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1891 [illegible] 22 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] ○ [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 8 [illegible] 1899 [illegible] ○ [illegible]

the appeal petition to the Govt and that the Dy: Commr: has passed orders without perusing the records connected with the Case.

Prays for early orders

L.S.G.
14.2.99.

Enclosures

Chief Commr's Endt No 2002 d/ 25.5.74
Anekal Taluk Amildar's notice d/ 22.8.77
Govt Endt No 3.24 d/ 1.4.96
Copy of Dy. Commr's order No 206 d/ 22.6.97
—— Asst. — — — — 507 d/ 15.8.97
—— Anekal Amildar's — — 465 d/ 27.7.
~~Sub~~ —— Extracts from Section Book for 1873-74
Dy Commr's order No 1060 d/ 21.1.97
One Genealogical Table
One charge sheet.

L.S.G.

R 15.2.99

COURT FEE — ONE RUPEE
[illegible]
6-2-99
[illegible]

COURT FEE — ONE RUPEE
[illegible]
6-2-99
80 [illegible]

Two Rs stamps affixed [illegible]

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. No 1339
DATE 8-2-99

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] /22 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1898 [illegible] 1764 [illegible]

[illegible] 4 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 25 [illegible]

[illegible] 1898 [illegible] /8 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 28 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1857 [illegible] 46 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1877 [illegible]

[illegible]

get

his

Venkat

t he has

submitted

17-2-99

1338 of 98. P.F. 37 of 96.

79

17/2/99 The above file containing the reps is put up

AK 17/2/99
Submitted with petn 1338

17-2-99

L.R. 116 93 - 16

✓

1899

No. 1339

Name of Petitioner Raghupathiah &c

Village } no 122. Lefferys Roa Cantonmen
Taluk } Bangalore
District }

Date of Arzi 8. 2. 99

Date of Receipt 8. 2. 99

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure 3

ABSTRACT

(In continuation of petn. No. 1338)

States that they are the descendants of Ramaya the deceased Shanbhogue, that they are the shareholders of half of the share, according to the decisions of the Judicial Court & the other (present) Court, & as can be found by the pay abstract also ([illegible]), & that Appajaya is quite a foreigner to the line.

Pray that the Shanbhogue may be registered in the minor Rama Moorthy's name.

Enclosures:

Govt. Sndts: Nos: 3120 & 3002

Authenticated copy of Extract of Vettana register.

L.S.G. 15. 2. 99.

82 (43) Procgs of the Govt of Mysore

Applts
(1) Ramamurti minor by guardian Nanjamma
(2) Raghupathi

Respts
(1) Ramachandria
(2) Appayya

Dft for appl
Subd to 1st Councillor
19/7/88

L.R. 116-93-17

11782

I have made an addn in the Procgs which please submit to Councillor for approval.
20/7/99

Subd to 2nd Councillor
21/7/88

RD 6 pm.
21.7.99.

Read:-

(1) Petition of appeal No 1390 of 97-98 presented by Raghupathi residing in the Civil & Military Station Bangalore, against the order of the Dy Commr Bangalore Dist rejecting his claim to the Shanbhogi office of Sidi hoskote and Anemkere in the Anekal taluk

(2) Petition No 1765 of 1897-98 presented by Nanjamma and Raghupathi complaining that their claim to the Shanbhogi of Vosemur in the Anekal taluk has not been disposed of by the Deputy Commr and is pending from 1893

(3) Correspondence ending with letter No 10,985, 18th February/98 from the Dy Commr Bangalore

Was my proposal provided in the matter the proceedings meet with approval
(I have [illegible] verbally from Councillor [illegible]
27/7/99)

[illegible]
26/7/99

Press copy [illegible] 2-8-99

Subd [illegible] 31/7/99

+ [illegible]

Distt reporting on the above.

(3) Records of the case

Read also:-

Petition No 1033 dated 3rd December/38 filed by the advocate for the appellants and specifying the causes of action in this case

The facts of the case are as follows.—

Prior to 1873, Subbaraya father of the 1st respondent, was the Shanbhog of Sidikos-Kote and Dodda Amanikere (constituting a single charge) and Raghupatiah, the 2nd applt was the Shanbhog of Gollahalli ~~and~~ or Naganna-Gollahalli as it is otherwise called). In 1873 Subbaraya, who had been previously punished for several irregularities, was dismissed for dishonesty tampering with and interpolating entries ~~alterations~~ in the Khirds. In

JM

In 1874 Raghupatayya who possessed a half share in the Shanbhogi hak was appointed as Shanbhog of the two villages of Sidihoshote ~~[illegible]~~ ammanakeri on probation in addition to his own village of Gollahalli.

In 1877 he was dismissed from the Shanbhogi of all the three villages for various offences including one of theft. One Sirappa, a stranger to the hakdar family, was appointed as Shanbhog of Sidi-hoshole & Ammanakeri. While the Shanbhog of Bommandy

86

of Subraya directed that Ramachandraiya, his adopted son, should be registered as the hakdar and Shanbhog of the two villages.

(3) In 1890 Nanjamma, widow of Ramabhadraiya, Raghupataiya's paternal uncle, represented to the Dy. Comr. that she was the hakdar to the Shanbhogi of the three villages (Siskoskote, Amanikere, & Gollahalli) & that the

same might be registered in the name of Ramamurti, son of Raghupataiya. In June 1891 the Dy. Comr. directed that Ramamurti should be registered as the hakdar Shanbhog of Gollahalli alone & Narjammei's subsequent petitions ~~[illegible]~~ claiming the registry of the other two villages were rejected.

Brummandahalli named Nanjundia was appointed as Shanbhog of Gollahalli as a temporary measure.

(2). In ~~Govt.~~ then Pro. No. 805/43 of 29-4-82 the Govt., on the representation of Subraya, the dismissed Shanbhog, limited the appointment of Smappa for a period of 10 years, & directed that the claims of Subraya's heirs should be considered at the end of that period. In ~~G.O.~~ Pro No. 1508/Camp of 13th Octr '87 the Govt., on the further representation of

(4) In 1893, the 2d appt's [illegible] father claimed half the official lands attached to the Shanbogi of Sidihoskote and [illegible] and was referred by the Dy Commr to a ~~civil~~ regular suit, on the ground that the lands had been enfranchised — On appeal the case was remanded to the Dy Commr for disposal on the merits, the Dy Commr having subsequently admitted that the lands had not been enfranchised. The Dy Commr passed a revised order, in Novr 1897, ~~stating~~ to the effect that the 2d appt's dismissal took place in 1877 and that his appeal was out of time by nearly 20 years. In his report to Govt, the Dy Commr states that the 2d appt must be considered to have lost all right to the lands when he was dismissed from the Office.

(5) Nanjamma appears

(43)

3t

1899-1900

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

PETITION

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 1st August 1899

No. 1092-99 / P. F. 39-94

Dismissing the appeal of (1) Ramamurti, minor, by guardian Nanjamma and (2) Raghupataiya of the Civil and Military Station, Bangalore, *re* their claim to the shanbhogi office of Sidihoskote, Amanikere and Nosenur in the Anekal taluk.

SBP—14-8-99—200

to have urged, in 1893, her claim to the Shanbhogi of Nose Nut on the ground that Ramia, the hakdar Shanbhog, who was dismissed in 1871, died childless, that the present Registerdar Appajia (2nd Respt) was not the adopted son of Ramia & that she was a nearer heir. No final order appears to have been passed by the Dy Commr on these petitions.

Please see para 75 of the Mem

Better omit the ~~A~~

In their appeal petitions to Govt, the appts urge that the adoptions set up by the Respts are false, and that they are therefore the proper hakdars to the Shanbogi of the villages held by the Respts.

Order thereon. No. 1032-34 / R.F.39-99 D/ 21.8.99.

(82)

The Govt see no sufficient grounds to interfere on behalf of the appts at this lapse of time. Out of the 3 ~~villages~~ Shanbogis in dispute, the 1st appt got one and the Respts got the other two ~~villages~~. It is not shown that they have no hak to the 2 ~~villages~~ given them. The appeal is, therefore, rejected.

[illegible] 25.7.99

[illegible] the adoption having been recognised by Govt so far back as 1880 and acted upon by the [illegible] as Shanbhog, the claim now urged cannot be entertained [illegible] The claim [illegible] which are in possession [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible]

Draft
C.H.2

For Secretary

To The Deputy Commr Bangalore with [illegible] & records
[illegible]

Proceedings of the Government of Mysore,

Appellants.		*Respondents.*
1. Ramamurti, minor, by guardian Nanjamma. 2. Raghupataiya.	*versus*	1. Ramachandraiya. 2. Appajaiya.

READ—

(1) Petition of Appeal No. 1390 of 1897-98, presented by Raghupataiya, residing in the Civil and Military Station, Bangalore, against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore district, rejecting his claim to the shanbhogi office of Sidihoskote and Amanikere in the Anekal taluk.

(2) Petition No. 1765 of 1897-98, presented by Nanjamma and Raghupataiya, complaining that their claim to the shanbhogi of Nosenur in the Anekal taluk has not been disposed of by the Deputy Commissioner and is pending from 1893.

(3) Correspondence ending with letter No. 1098, dated 18th February 1898, from the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore district, reporting on the above.

(4) Records of the case.

READ ALSO—

Petition No. 1033, dated 3rd December 1898, filed by the Advocate for the appellants and specifying the causes of action in this case.

The facts of the case are as follows :—

Prior to 1873, Subbaraya, father of the 1st respondent, was the shanbhog of Sidihoskote and Doddamanikere (constituting a single charge) and Raghupataiya, the 2nd appellant, was the shanbhog of Gollahalli or Nosenur Gollahalli as it is otherwise called. In 1873, Subbaraya, who had been previously punished for several irregularities, was dismissed for dishonestly tampering with and altering certain entries in the khirdi. In 1874, Raghupataiya, who possessed a half share in the shanbhogi hak, was appointed as shanbhog of the two villages of Sidihoskote and Doddamanikere, on probation, in addition to his own village of Gollahalli. In 1877, he was dismissed from the shanbhogi of all the three villages for various offences including one of theft. One Surappa, a stranger to the hakdar family, was appointed as shanbhog of Sidihoskote and Doddamanikere, while the shanbhog of Bommandahalli named Nanjundaiya was appointed as shanbhog of Gollahalli as a temporary measure.

2. In their Proceedings No. 805—13, dated 29th April 1882, the Government, on the representation of Subbaraya, the dismissed shanbhog, limited the appointment of Surappa for a period of 10 years, and directed that the claims of Subbaraya's heirs should be considered at the end of that period. In Proceedings No. 1508—Camp, dated 13th October 1887, the Government, on the further representation of Subbaraya, directed that Ramachandraiya, his adopted son, should be registered as the hakdar shanbhog of the said two villages.

3. In 1890, Nanjamma, widow of Ramabhadraiya, Raghupataiya's paternal uncle, represented to the Deputy Commissioner, that she was the hakdar to the shanbhogi of the three villages (Sidihoskote, Amanikere and Gollahalli) and that the same might be registered in the name of Ramamurti, son of Raghupataiya. In June 1891, the Deputy Commissioner directed that Ramamurti should be registered as the hakdar shanbhog of Gollahalli alone, and Nanjamma's subsequent petitions claiming the registry of the other two villages were rejected.

4. In 1893, the 2nd appellant, the said Raghupataiya, claimed half the official lands attached to the shanbhogi of Sidihoskote and Amanikere and was referred by the Deputy Commissioner to a regular suit, on the ground that the lands had been enfranchised. On appeal the case was remanded to the Deputy Commissioner for disposal on the merits, the Deputy Commissioner having subsequently admitted that the lands had not been enfranchised. The Deputy Commissioner passed a revised order in November 1897 to the effect that the 2nd appellant's dismissal took place in 1877, and that his appeal was out of time by nearly 20 years. In his report to Government, the Deputy Commissioner states that the 2nd appellant must be considered to have lost all right to the lands when he was dismissed from the office.

5. Nanjamma appears to have urged, in 1893, her claim to the shanbhogi of Nosenur on the ground that Ramaiya, the hakdar shanbhog, who was dismissed in 1871, died childless, that the present registerdar, Appajaiya (2nd respondent), was not the adopted son of Ramaiya and that she was a nearer heir.

6. In their appeal petitions to Government, the appellants urge that the adoptions set up by the respondents are false, and that they are therefore the proper hakdars to the shanbhogi of the villages held by the respondents.

No. 1092-99—P. F. 39-94, DATED BANGALORE, 1ST AUGUST 1899.

ORDER THEREON.—The Government see no sufficient grounds to interfere on behalf of the appellants at this lapse of time. The adoption of 1st respondent having been recognised by Government so far back as 1887 and acted upon by the registry of his name as hakdar, the objection now urged cannot be entertained. Equally untenable is the contention as regards the alleged adoption of 2nd respondent. The claim to the official lands, which are in possession and enjoyment of respondents as sharers in the shanbhogi, is inadmissible under Potgi Rules 27 and 28. Out of the three charges in dispute, the 1st appellant got one and the respondents got the other two. It is not shown that the latter have no hak to the two charges given to them. The appeal to Government is, therefore, dismissed.

C. SREENIVASIENGAR,
Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, with records.
The Deputy Commissioners of other Districts.

Exd.—H.A.R.

971-[illegible] 6
1050-1
1239-1
1338-10
1339-3
1760-2

(42)

93

L.R. 116-93-18

1370-1765
[illegible]
23 [illegible]
2-8-99

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 3-12-98
[illegible] 1033 [illegible]

[illegible]

31-7-99-

8.0

For Secretary

[illegible] 31-7-99.

For Secretary

COURT FEE

1-2-5?

TWO RUPEES

Two stamps affixed

[illegible] OFFICE.
[illegible] DEPARTMENT.
REGD. No. 5879
6-9-57

[illegible]

116-93-19

[illegible]

I [illegible]

1 [illegible]

2 [illegible]

3 [illegible]

4 [illegible] III

5 [illegible] II

II [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

III [illegible]

[illegible]

IV [illegible]

[illegible]

I [illegible]

II [illegible]

III [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

26 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

(45)

[illegible] 581 [illegible]:20 [illegible]

97

L.R. 11693-20

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 31-7-99 [illegible] 1390-1765 [illegible]

[illegible] 2-9-99 [illegible] 581 [illegible]

[illegible] 1900 [illegible]

Ch.

Offt.

For Secretary.

108

1900 (46)

No. 711

Name of Petitioners (1) Ramamurti, minor by Guardian mother, Subbamma Kenchamma and (2) Raghupataiya residing in No 122

Village, Taluk, District: Sepping Road C & M. Station Bangalore

Date of Arzi 12. 10. 00

Date of Receipt 13. 10. 00

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil

In re Revenue Appeals 305 : 300 705 and 88 of 1897-98

ABSTRACT

Appellants. Respondents
Ramamurty & Raghupataiya ~~Vs~~ Ramachandra Appaji

State that the grandfather of the 1st Appellant was in enjoyment of the Shanbogi hak of Sidihoskote, Doddakere, Hosur and Golahalli in obedience ~~of~~ to the decision No 76 of the year 1867, that in ~~[illegible]~~ accordance with the Chief Commissioner's final decision of the year 1877 the second appellant was in

---

reqd
26/10/00

S. 897-98 Genl. R. 100
Please put up
O.P. 39 774

3 S. 21
27/10

Please file put up
P.B.
27/10/00

27/10

L.R. 116-93-21

Subd.
1) ~~Second Review~~ application of Govt. order dated 1.8.1899. The first Review application was rejected by endt. No 88 dated 15.9.00
2) Stamp sufficient
3) In time

1/11/00. This may be filed and the petr. informed that the matter having been already decided by Govt., further petitions from him will be filed.
2/11/00.

Petitioner informed
given to be filed

Endt. put up
7/11

In person
To Pat for
[illegible]
13/10/1

Two the stamp affixed [illegible]

[illegible]

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REG'D. No 711 P

1897-98-99 [illegible]

1390—1765+583—10-900

[illegible]

1 [illegible]

2 [illegible]

[illegible]

1 [illegible]

2 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 2 [illegible] 3 [illegible] 4 [illegible] 57 [illegible] 46 [illegible] 1 [illegible] 69-70-71 [illegible] 7-17-24 [illegible] 73 [illegible] 77 [illegible] 2 [illegible]

[illegible] 77 [illegible] 2 [illegible] 83 [illegible] 30 [illegible] 86 [illegible] 22 [illegible] 87-89 [illegible] 2 [illegible] 1 [illegible] 91 [illegible] 22 [illegible] 206 [illegible] 4 [illegible]

in possession of the said shanbhogi Hak '77; that the Dy Commr: passed order no 206 d/22.6.91 directing the ~~appoint~~ registry ~~ment~~ of the Shanbhogi Hak in the name of the 1st Appellant; that he has submitted several petitions bringing to notice the fact ~~that~~ the taluk authorities, in spite of the said order, have delivered possession of the inams of only of 4 of the villages & those of the 3 remaining villages have been given over to foreigners. the 1st & 2nd Respondents; that they have been given endorsements directing that nothing can be done in the matter &c; that the 1st Respondent was not adopted by the deceased Ramabhadraiya; that the 2nd Respdt. has not been adopted by any; that they are ready to prove that the Respdts: ~~Can~~ have no claim to the office; and pray that the inams in the 3 villages may be ordered to be made over to appellants.

23/10/00

1614 [illegible] 7/11 ~~48~~ 12-11-1900

47

L. R. 116-93-22

[illegible]

[illegible] 22 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 100 [illegible]

[illegible] 12-10-1900 [illegible]

[illegible] 7.11 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 7-11 [illegible]

By order

Off. 7/11/00.

for Secretary